

REMARKS

Responsive to the outstanding Office Action, applicant has carefully studied the Examiner's rejections and the comments relative thereto. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the following detailed arguments.

After amendment, claims 12-26 are pending in this application. In this response, claims 12-13, 15, 18-22, and 24-26 have been amended. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been introduced by this amendment.

ABSTRACT

The abstract we objected to for containing legal phraseology. In response thereto the abstract has been canceled and a new abstract has been submitted herein. The new abstract describes the invention as claimed in claim 12. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection is therefore requested.

SPECIFICATION

The Examiner objected to the specification for failing to include reference numeral 12 as depicted on the drawings. In response thereto, paragraph [0022] has been amended herein to include a description of reference numeral 12. As this line was originally depicted on the drawings, this feature would be recognizable to one skilled in the art and therefore the inclusion of this description does not constitute new matter.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 12-26 were rejected under 25 USC 112, second paragraph, but were indicated as being allowable if these rejections were overcome. For the reasons below, it is believed that all of these rejections have been overcome, and allowance of the application is therefore respectfully requested.

IN THE DRAWINGS

The Examiner objected to the drawings for failing to include descriptive and concise text legends. In response, it is first respectfully submitted that such legends are optional, and it is believed that they are not necessary for an understanding of the drawings on file. However, to expedite prosecution of the application substitute drawing sheets are hereby submitted including such legends. Upon approval of the Examiner, inclusion of these sheets for the sheets presently on file is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §112, second paragraph

Claims 12-26 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. The Examiner made several specific rejections.

Claim 12 was amended to provide proper antecedent basis for the agitating device and “a” was inserted before pump

Claim 13 was amended to provide antecedent basis for feed cycle.

Claim 15 was amended to depend from claim 13 to provide antecedent basis for feed cycle.

Similar changes were made to the remainder of the claims providing antecedent basis in the claims or amending the claims to provide antecedent basis.

In view of the above reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

For the reasons above, it is submitted that independent claim 12 is allowable over the applied art of record. The remaining claims are believed to be allowable based, at least, upon their dependence from allowable base claims as shown above.

Should the Examiner wish to modify any of the language of the claims, applicants' attorney suggests a telephone interview in order to expedite the prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark A Hixon/
Mark A. Hixon
Registration No. 44,766

ATTORNEYS

Marshall & Melhorn, LLC
Four SeaGate - 8th Floor
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(419) 249-7114
(419) 249-7151 Facsimile
HIXON@MARSHALL-MELHORN.COM